

## REMARKS

The objection to claim 2 because of a typographical error is noted. This claim has been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comment to correct the typographical error and obviate the basis for objection. Favorable consideration is solicited.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Shutic et al. '084. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, which has been amended merely to clarify an aspect of the claimed invention that is inherent in the claim as originally presented, now specifically recites "at least one manual coating station arranged outside of the compartment and adjacent the aperture as seen in conveying direction (T) of the workpieces (W)".

In addition, the dependent claims 2, 7, 8 are further limited by the specific recitations of "the manual coating station is located upstream of a first aperture", and "the standing floor (34, 44) is freely accessible from the side opposite the rear wall", and "a partial roof cover (38, 48) of the or each manual coating station is integrated with the rear wall".

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Shutic et al. '084 which is understood to locate a manual spraying area 46 inside the booth, and at that, downstream (not upstream) of booth inlet 26.

This is contrary to the Examiner's assertion of the booth inlet at 12. Thus, manual spraying according to this reference would be performed inside the booth, as an undesirable worker environment, and access to a standing floor as claimed is not possible except through the booth inlet or outlet and is obstructed by the side walls. The deficient disclosure of this reference therefore cannot anticipate claim 1 or the dependent claims 2, 7, 8 that are thus submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

The advisory in paragraph 5 of the official action is noted with appreciation.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutic et al. '084 (as applied to claim 1) further in view of Kramer et al. '098. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This dependent claim is specifically limited by the recitations of "at least one manual coating station arranged outside of the compartment and adjacent the aperture as seen in conveying direction (T) of the workpieces (W)", and "each aperture (16; 19) is adapted to be closed by a door".

These aspects of the claimed invention promote separation of a manual coating station located outside the compartment from the automatic coating station within the compartment. These aspects are not shown or even suggested by the references considered either alone or in the

combination proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, Shutic et al. '084 is deficient of disclosure of a manual coating station disposed outside of the compartment containing the automatic coating station, as discussed in the above Remarks regarding claim 1, and the cleaning mechanism of Kramer et al. '098 is not understood to disclose or even suggest such arrangement of manual and automatic coating stations. A combination of these deficient disclosures therefore does not establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness can be made. It is therefore respectfully submitted that dependent claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutic et al. '084 (as applied to claim 1) further in view of Domicent ' 289. This rejection is respectfully traversed. This dependent claim is further limited by the specific recitations of "at least one manual coating station arranged outside of the compartment and adjacent the aperture as seen in conveying direction (T) of the workpieces (W)", and "lamps are mounted on the outside of the compartment to illuminate the coating place of the or each manual coating station".

These aspects of the claimed invention are not shown or even suggested by the references considered alone or in the combination proposed

by the Examiner. Specifically, the deficient disclosure of Shutic et al. '084 is discussed in the above Remarks regarding claim 1. And, Domicent '289 is understood to disclose only lights for illuminating within a coating compartment. There is thus no sufficient disclosure or even any suggestion or instruction contained in these combined references to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a determination of obviousness could properly be made. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the dependent claim 9 is now patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Allowability of claims 3-5 is noted with appreciation. Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate the base and intervening claims, and claims 4 and 5 properly depend from independent claim 3. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 3-5 are now patentable to applicants.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all claims is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTOPH KELLER, et al.

Dated: 8/29/03

By: Albert C. Smith  
Albert C. Smith, Reg. No. 20,355  
Fenwick & West LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Telephone (650) 335-7296  
Fax (650) 938-5200